REMARKS

The foregoing amendment amends independent claims 1, 12, 23 and 24 to include the subject matter of claims 4. Claims 4 and 15 are canceled and consequential amendments are made to claims 5 and 16. Now in the application are Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-26 of which Claims 1, 12, 23 and 24 are independent. *No new matter has been added.*

Amendment and/or cancellation of the claims is not to be construed as an acquiescence to any of the objections/rejections set forth in the instant Office Action, and was done solely to expedite prosecution of the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as originally filed, or similar claims, in this or one or more subsequent patent applications.

Interview with the Examiner

Applicants also note with appreciation the courtesy of the Examiner in the opportunity of the interview on August 10, 2007, and the helpful comments proffered at that time.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Garvey et al. (5,774,667) (hereinafter "Garvey"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1-11

Amended Claim 1 is independent and Claims 2-3 and 5-11 depend from Claim 1. As Claims 2-3 and 5-11 depend from amended Claim 1, they incorporate each and every element of amended Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of now-canceled claim 4. Claim 1 distinguishes patentably over the cited Garvey reference.

Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 1-3 and 5-11, as amended. Specifically, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing a portion of a plurality of *different* network device types equal to the first value. In

addition, Garvey fails to disclose the cited steps of concurrently displaying values of network objects on a display, receiving one or more user inputs specifying a plurality of network objects representing the one or more portions of the plurality of different network device types and receiving a value from the user for the plurality of network objects representing the one or more portions of the *plurality* of different network device types, as now recited in independent claim 1.

Garvey discusses using a set of graphical user interface cues that allow multiple instances of the same type of network device to be set up simultaneously with the same windows used to set up a single network device, (Garvey, Col. 5, lines 46-50). The ability of setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing one or more portions of a plurality of *different network device types* equal to the indicated value is not disclosed by Garvey. Garvey merely discloses simultaneously editing several same type network objects on several same type network devices, for example, two different remove access servers (Garvey, Col. 6, lines 33-37). Garvey is specifically directed to computer networks where "there exists more than one of the same type of network device" (Garvey, Col. 5, line 31-32). In contrast, the present application is directed to setting a value of multiple network objects representing multiple *different network device types*, as recited in the claims.

In addition, Garvey describes a different process for editing the parameters of the two remote access servers at the same time than the claimed method. For example, Garvey does not disclose the step of concurrently displaying values of network objects on a display, including values of a plurality of network objects representing the one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types, to a user. In Garvey, "if the two remote access servers have different parameter values for a particular parameter set using a pop up menu, then that parameter menu field is left blank" (see Garvey, column 6, lines 5-10). Garvey does not therefore disclose displaying values for a plurality of different network device types, but rather, only the same (single) parameter value applicable only to devices of the *same type*. In addition, Garvey is not capable of allowing a user to specify a plurality of network objects representing portions of a plurality of *different* network device types and/or allowing a user to specify a value

from the user for the different network device types, as set forth in amended claim 1. Garvey only allows a user to select objects of the same type to simultaneously edit.

Furthermore, Garvey teaches away from the claimed invention. Garvey teaches modifying the same type of network objects representing the same type of network devices. That is, after selecting the same type of network objects, Garvey teaches displaying the attributes of the objects in a window. The window displays one specific layout illustrating the attributes of the selected type of network objects, see Figure 13 of Garvey. Therefore, in Garvey, the user has to choose the same type of network devices that will have the same layout of attributes. However, the present invention discloses a user interface that enables a user to set the attributes of *different* types of network objects representing different types of network devices. See Fig. 5 of the instant application. That is, in accordance with the teachings of the present invention, the user can choose multiple different types of network objects representing multiple different types of network devices and modify one or more attributes at the same time.

The present invention allows the users to select multiple network objects from multiple different network device types to set the values of the network objects. According to Claim 1, the user indicates a value only once, and the selected network objects representing *multiple* different device types are set to the indicated value. In Garvey, the user can only simultaneously configure the same type of network devices. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 1-3 and 5-11, as amended.

In addition, Garvey does not disclose using at least one table, as set forth in claims 5-11.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 1-3 and 5-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claims passed to allowance.

Claims 12-22

Amended claim 12 is independent and Claims 13-22 depend from Claim 12. Claim 12 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 4. As claims 12-22 depend from amended Claim 12, they incorporate each and every element of amended Claim 12. Claim 12 recites "a user interface to enable the user to indicate a first value for which to set the plurality of network

objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* by specifying the first value only once" and "a message component to initiate setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects *representing one or more portions of a plurality of different network device types* equal to the first value."

Garvey also fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 12-14 and 16-22. As discussed above, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing a portion of a plurality of *different network device types* equal to the first value. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 12-14 and 16-22, as amended.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claims 12-14 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claims passed to allowance.

Claim 23

Independent Claim 23 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 4. Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 23, as amended. As discussed above, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing a portion of a plurality of *different network device types* equal to the first value. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 23, as amended.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claim passed to allowance.

Claim 24

Independent Claim 24 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 4 as well. Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 24, as amended. As discussed above, Garvey fails to disclose setting a value of each of the plurality of network objects representing one or more portions of a plurality of *different network device types* equal to the first value. As such, Garvey fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 24, as amended.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and the claim passed to allowance.

Claim 25 is dependent on claim 2, and thus, incorporates all the patentable subject matter of claim 2. Claim 26 is dependent on claim 13, and thus, incorporates all the patentable subject matter of claim 13. None of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest the first network device being *a different network device* than the second network device.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this statement. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. ENB-008RCE from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By David R. Burns

David R. Burns
Registration No.: 46,590
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant